

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CARINA CONERLY,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:20-cv-362-KJM-KJN PS

ORDER

(ECF Nos. 1, 10, 15)

On April 29, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations (ECF No. 16) which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. On May 8, 2020, plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations (ECF No. 17), which have been considered by the court.

This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which an objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981); *see also Dawson v. Marshall*, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the matter on the applicable law. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's

////

1 conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d
2 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

3 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,
4 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the findings and recommendations in full. Accordingly,
5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 16) are ADOPTED IN FULL;
- 7 2. Plaintiffs' Complaint (ECF No. 1) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; and
- 8 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

9 DATED: July 17, 2020.

10 
11 _____
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28